

## REMARKS

1. Applicant thanks the Examiner for the Examiner's comments which have greatly assisted Applicant in responding.
2. 35 U.S.C. §103(a). The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-27 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Liles et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,880,731), Albrecht et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,950,011), Janis (U.S. Patent No. 5,263,165), and Cutler et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,129,083).

### Claims 1, 10, and 19:

The Examiner states:

"Liles rendered obvious independent claims 1, 10, and 19 by the following:

'...providing a user defined ...list...' at col. 13, lines 65-67 and col. 14, lines 1-2.

'...containing user identifications...' at col. 7, lines 12-14.

'...user defined...' at col. 13, lines 65-67 and col. 14, lines 1-2.

'...referring to said user defined...list...' at col. 13, lines 65-67 and col. 14, lines 1-2.

'...allowing said...user identifications...' at col. 7, lines 12-14."

Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Claims 1, 10 , and 19 appear as follows:

1. A process for a simplified access control language that controls access to directory entries in a computer environment, comprising the steps of:
  - providing a user defined read list containing user identifications that are allowed to read a specified set of attributes;
  - providing a system administrator defined read access control command;

said read access control command listing the user attributes that said administrator has selected for user defined read access; and

said read access control command referring to said user defined read list thereby allowing said read user identifications read access to said user attributes.

10. An apparatus for a simplified access control language that controls access to directory entries in a computer environment, comprising:

a user defined read list containing user identifications that are allowed to read a specified set of attributes; and

a system administrator defined read access control command;

wherein said read access control command lists the user attributes that said administrator has selected for user defined read access; and

wherein said read access control command refers to said user defined read list thereby allowing said read user identifications read access to said user attributes.

19. A program storage medium readable by a computer, tangibly embodying a program of instructions executable by the computer to perform method steps for a simplified access control language that controls access to directory entries in a computer environment, comprising the steps of:

providing a user defined read list containing user identifications that are allowed to read a specified set of attributes;

providing a system administrator defined read access control command;

said read access control command listing the user attributes that said administrator has selected for user defined read access; and

said read access control command referring to said user defined read list thereby allowing said read user identifications read access to said user attributes.

In particular, Liles does not teach or disclose a system providing a user defined read list containing user identifications that are allowed to read a specified set of attributes

as claimed in the invention. Liles teaches away from the invention as claimed by teaching that a user using an avatar to represent himself can chat with other users where the user "determines the participants with whom the user will always interact" (col. 13, line 65-col. 14, line 2). Liles does not teach or disclose what is claimed in the invention.

Liles further is non-analogous art. Liles teaches an avatar system that is concerned with facial expressions on an avatar's face and chat sessions between users. The present invention is a simplified access control language used for accessing directory entries in a computer system. There are no similarities in the structure and function between Liles and the present invention while the differences of Liles and the present invention are evident. Also, Liles is **not** a reference that is reasonably pertinent because the matter with which it deals (*i.e.*, an avatar chat system), logically would **not** have commended itself to an inventor's attention in considering the problem solved by the present invention (simplifying an access control language). (*Wang Laboratories Inc. v. Toshiba Corp.*, 993 F.2d 858, 26 USPQ2d 1767 (Fed. Cir. 1993))

Additionally, the Examiner combines non-analogous art to reach the rejection of Claims 1, 10, and 19. Liles teaches an avatar system that is concerned with facial expressions on an avatar's face and chat sessions between users. While Albrecht, Janis, and Cutler have no relationship to avatars or chat sessions. Albrecht teaches a system whose object is to provide a system for configuring software in open systems using network topology and configuration parameters of the various elements which compose the network (col. 2, line 14-col. 3, line 5). Janis teaches an improved data processing system (col. 2,, lines 26-27). Cutler teaches an object based operating system for a multi-tasking computer system (Abstract). Therefore, Liles is non-analogous art to Albrecht, Janis, and Cutler.

Further, there is no suggestion or motivation to combine Liles with Albrecht, Janis, and Cutler. As noted above, Liles is concerned with avatar facial expressions and user chat sessions. Liles is not concerned with file accesses by other users or system security with respect to said files. There is no suggestion or motivation in Liles to

combine it with Albrecht, Janis, or Cutler. Additionally, there is no suggestion in the prior art that the cited combination is desirable. (*In re Mills*, 916 F.2d 680, 16 USPQ2d 1430 (Fed. Cir. 1990))

Therefore, Liles, Albrecht, Janis, and Cutler do not teach or disclose the invention as claimed.

To combine the cited references in the manner stated in the Office Action and, further, to cite said references against partial phrases of the claimed elements as stated in the Office Action would require information gleaned from the present invention. Such use of hindsight is impermissible.

Claims 1, 10, and 19 are in allowable condition. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Claims 5, 14, and 23:

As noted above, Liles is non-analogous art. Liles teaches an avatar system that is concerned with facial expressions on an avatar's face and chat sessions between users. The present invention is a simplified access control language used for accessing directory entries in a computer system. There are no similarities in the structure and function between Liles and the present invention while the differences of Liles and the present invention are evident. Also, Liles is **not** a reference that is reasonably pertinent because the matter with which it deals (*i.e.*, an avatar chat system), logically would **not** have commended itself to an inventor's attention in considering the problem solved by the present invention (simplifying an access control language). (*Wang Laboratories Inc. v. Toshiba Corp.*, 993 F.2d 858, 26 USPQ2d 1767 (Fed. Cir. 1993))

Additionally, the Examiner combines non-analogous art to reach the rejection of Claims 5, 14, and 23. Liles teaches an avatar system that is concerned with facial expressions on an avatar's face and chat sessions between users. While Albrecht,

Janis, and Cutler have no relationship to avatars or chat sessions. Albrecht teaches a system whose object is to provide a system for configuring software in open systems using network topology and configuration parameters of the various elements which compose the network (col. 2, line 14-col. 3, line 5). Janis teaches an improved data processing system (col. 2,, lines 26-27). Cutler teaches an object based operating system for a multi-tasking computer system (Abstract). Therefore, Liles is non-analogous art to Albrecht, Janis, and Cutler.

Further, there is no suggestion or motivation to combine Liles with Albrecht, Janis, and Cutler. As noted above, Liles is concerned with avatar facial expressions and user chat sessions. Liles is not concerned with file accesses by other users or system security with respect to said files. There is no suggestion or motivation in Liles to combine it with Albrecht, Janis, or Cutler. Additionally, there is no suggestion in the prior art that the cited combination is desirable. (*In re Mills*, 916 F.2d 680, 16 USPQ2d 1430 (Fed. Cir. 1990))

Therefore, Liles, Albrecht, Janis, and Cutler do not teach or disclose the invention as claimed.

To combine the cited references in the manner stated in the Office Action and, further, to cite said references against partial sections of the claimed elements as stated in the Office Action would require information gleaned from the present invention. Such use of hindsight is impermissible.

Claims 5, 14, and 23 are in allowable condition. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Claims 6, 15, and 24:

As with Claims 1, 10, and 19, above, Claims 6, 15, and 24 are in allowable condition. Claims 6, 15, and 24 Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Claims 2, 11, and 20:

The rejection of Claims 2, 11, and 20 is deemed moot in view of Applicant's remarks regarding Claims 1, 10, and 19, above. Claims 2, 11, and 20 are dependent upon independent Claims 1, 10, and 19, respectively, which are in allowable condition. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Claims 3, 12, and 21:

The rejection of Claims 3, 12, and 21 is deemed moot in view of Applicant's remarks regarding Claims 1, 10, and 19, above. Claims 3, 12, and 21 are dependent upon independent Claims 1, 10, and 19, respectively, which are in allowable condition. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Claims 4, 13, and 22:

The rejection of Claims 4, 12, and 22 is deemed moot in view of Applicant's remarks regarding Claims 1, 10, and 19, above. Claims 4, 12, and 22 are dependent upon independent Claims 1, 10, and 19, respectively, which are in allowable condition. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Claims 7, 16, and 25:

The rejection of Claims 7, 16, and 25 is deemed moot in view of Applicant's remarks regarding Claims 6, 15, and 24, above. Claims 7, 16, and 25 are dependent upon independent Claims 6, 15, and 24, respectively, which are in allowable condition. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Claims 8, 17, and 26:

The rejection of Claims 8, 17, and 26 is deemed moot in view of Applicant's remarks regarding Claims 6, 15, and 24, above. Claims 8, 17, and 26 are dependent upon independent Claims 6, 15, and 24, respectively, which are in allowable condition. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Claims 9, 18, and 27:

The rejection of Claims 9, 18, and 27 is deemed moot in view of Applicant's remarks regarding Claims 6, 15, and 24, above. Claims 9, 18, and 27 are dependent upon independent Claims 6, 15, and 24, respectively, which are in allowable condition. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

**CONCLUSION**

Based on the foregoing, Applicant considers the present invention to be distinguished from the art of record. Accordingly, Applicant earnestly solicits the Examiner's withdrawal of the rejections raised in the above referenced Office Action, such that a Notice of Allowance is forwarded to Applicant, and the present application is therefore allowed to issue as a United States patent.

Respectfully Submitted,



Michael A. Glenn,  
Reg. No. 30,176

Customer No. 22862